



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/609,325

06/27/2003

Vincent S. Darago

5045.2.1D

7892

23484

7590

10/23/2008

OGILVIE LAW FIRM

1320 EAST LAIRD AVENUE

SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84105

EXAMINER

HOANG, HIEU T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2452

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/23/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/609,325	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DARAGO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> HIEU T. HOANG	<b>Art Unit</b> 2452	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 86-110 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 86-110 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 7/24/08 has been entered.
2. Claims 86-110 are pending.

**Formatted:** Font: Not Bold, Not Italic

**Formatted:** Left, Indent: First line: 36 pt, Don't keep with next

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments filed 05/14/2007 have been fully considered but they are moot in view of new ground(s) of rejection.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112*

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claims 87-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Consider claim 87, the claim recites "a peer node" twice on lines 7 and 9. It is vague whether these two peer nodes are the same. Claims 100, 103, 105 also recite "a peer node" same as "a peer node" in claim 87, and are rejected for the same rationale. Correction is required.

Art Unit: 2452

6. Claims 101 and 102 recite "peer nodes". It is vague whether these peer nodes are the same as the peer node requesting content in claim 87. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 87, 88, 95-100, 102-106 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiser et al. (US 6,385,596, hereafter Wiser), in view of what was known in the art at the time of the invention.

9. For claim 87, Wiser discloses a method for managing content in an operating environment that includes nodes, the method comprising the steps of:

- registering users (col. 4 lines 13-14, a consumer registers with the media licensing center);
- checking user passwords to prevent unregistered users from receiving content services (col. 4 lines 19-27, col. 9 lines 19-24, user passphrase created in the registration process used to authenticate the user from accessing media);

Art Unit: 2452

- receiving at a node a request by a registered user for access to content (col. 9, lines 56-60, delivery server receives requests for a media data file) which contains at least one previously treated critical portion (col. 9, lines 25-34, encrypted media data file-related portion); and
- serving at least the critical portion over a network communications link to a node for presentation to the registered user (col. 9 lines 60-67, deliver the requested media with encrypted portions).

Wiser does not disclose that the invention is applied to peer nodes in a peer-to-peer network.

Official Notice is taken that peer-to-peer networks are known in the art for content distribution (see e.g., Shear et al., US 2001/0042043, title, abstract, [0044], media rights management in a peer-to-peer distributed environment)

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser and what was known in the art in order to apply content distribution scheme of Wiser to a peer-to-peer networks to take advantage of peer-to-peer environment such as good scalability and availability of content.

10. For claim 88, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the serving step serves digital content that contains at least one musical recording (Wiser, abstract).

11. For claim 95, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the critical portion comprises encrypted content (Wiser, col. 7 lines 27-30).

12. For claim 96, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the critical portion comprises compressed content (Wiser, col. 7 lines 20-25).
13. For claim 97, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the critical portion comprises licensed content (Wiser, col. 10 lines 18-24).
14. For claim 98, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the critical portion comprises content that is compressed and encrypted (Wiser, col. 7 lines 20-30).
15. For claim 99, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON discloses the step of disabling use of at least a portion of the content after an expected security handshake is not received (Wiser, col. 10 lines 23-36, audio image data can only be used after authentication using public-private keys).
16. For claim 100, as applied to claim 87, Wiser does not disclose the step of downloading at least a portion of the content to a peer node at least one hour before the serving step. However, Official Notice is taken that it was well known how to download a portion of content before serving the content (see e.g., Metz et al., US 5,768,539, col. 38 lines 29-35, download an application file and image before execution of the application). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser and what was known in the art to download a portion of the content at least one hour (or any time in advance) before serving the content to serve content locally for better performance and quality.
17. For claim 102, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the method moves content to peer nodes in response to actual requests from users (Wiser, col. 9 lines 54-67, deliver content upon user request).

Art Unit: 2452

18. For claim 103, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the method operates in conjunction with a license enforcement software program executing on a client node (Wiser, col. 10 lines 13-16).

19. For claim 104, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the method tracks content use in order to create records on which invoices are at least partially based (Wiser, col. 9 lines 40-52).

20. For claim 105, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses the method tracks content location and determines whether content is already resident on a peer node at or near a location at which content is requested (Wiser, col. 17, lines 7-21, requested content is checked for availability at nearby nodes at which content is requested).

21. For claim 106, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON further discloses only authenticated network users are able to access the content (Wiser, col. 9 lines 19-37, authentication of users for providing content).

22. Claims 89-94, 101 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiser, in view of what has been known in the art and Salesky et al. (US 6,343,313, hereafter Salesky)

23. For claims 89 and 90, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON does not disclose the serving step serves digital content that contains visual images. However, Salesky discloses the same (Salesky, col. 3 lines 24-26, visual images, col. 3 lines 30-33,

Art Unit: 2452

video). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser, ON and Salesky to provide more variety of content such as images and video to users.

24. For claim 91, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON does not disclose the method delivers content by synchronous sharing. However, Salesky discloses real time sharing or streaming of audio and video conferences (Salesky, col. 3 lines 42-50). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser, ON and Salesky to provide more variety of content such as real time video conferencing to users.

25. For claim 92, as applied to claim 91. Salesky-Wiser further discloses the method comprises video conferencing (Salesky, col. 3 lines 42-50).

26. For claims 93 and 94, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON does not disclose the method delivers content in a real-time manner and/or and interactive manner. However, Salesky discloses the same (Salesky, col. 3 lines 42-50; col. 3 lines 42-50, video conference is an interactive application). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser, ON and Salesky to deliver content in a real-time manner and/or and interactive manner so that users can interact more efficiently with one another.



Art Unit: 2452

27. For claim 101, as applied to claim 87, Wiser-ON does not disclose the method moves content to peer nodes in response to anticipated requests from users. However, Salesky discloses a method of prerecording conference content and delivering them upon anticipation of a time of conference (Salesky, col. 9 line 64-col. 10 line 7). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser, ON and Salesky to deliver content to nodes in response to anticipated requests from users so that sessions can be preserved and provided when appropriate delivery time comes.

28. Claims 86 and 107-110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiser, in view of what has been known in the art (Official Notice or ON), and Shear et al. (US 6,157,721, hereafter Shear).

29. For claim 86, Wiser discloses a method for managing content in a shared use operating environment (abstract), the shared use operating environment including a registration server (fig. 1B media licensing center 110), a content server connectable by a network link to the registration server (fig. 1B content manager 112), and a client workstation connectable by a client-server network communications link to the content server (fig. 1A, client system 126 linked to content manager 112 of fig. 1B), the method comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2452

- registering a user at the registration server, thereby characterizing the user as a registered user (col. 4 lines 13-14, a consumer registers with the media licensing center);
- receiving at the content server a request by the registered user for access to content (col. 9, lines 56-60, delivery server receives requests for a media data file) which contains at least one previously treated critical portion (col. 9, lines 25-34, encrypted media data file-related portion);
- authenticating the request (fig. 9BA, authenticate consumer certificate with receipt 946)
- serving at least the critical portion over the client-server network communications link for presentation to the registered user at the client workstation (col. 9 lines 60-67, deliver the requested media with encrypted portions);

Wiser does not disclose disabling caching and other disk writes to prevent a copy of the critical portion of the content from being created on nonvolatile storage at the client workstation;

However, official notice is taken that it was well known in the art how to disable caching and other disk writes (see e.g. Fabrizio et al., US 5,875,474, col. 4 lines 56-65, col. 5 line 27, disabling disk caching).

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser and what was known in the art in order to disable caching and writing to prevent license information being copied or reproduced at the client's computer. The motivation is provided by Shear, whose method allows users

to view a particular multimedia presentation, delivered from a provider, while prevent the users from making a copy of the presentation (col. 8 lines 57-62).

30. For claim 107, as applied to claim 86, Wiser further discloses reserving a particular piece of content for a particular registered user (Wiser, fig. 9AB, col. 16 l. 67-col. 17 l. 5, reservation of content). Wiser and Shear do not disclose the piece of content is courseware content. However, Official Notice is taken that courseware content was well known in the art at the time of the invention (see e.g. Hollingsworth et al., US 6,157,808, abstract, training course content). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to apply the teachings of Wiser, Shear to what was known about courseware to reserve a piece of courseware content for users.

31. For claim 108, as applied to claim 86, Wiser-ON-Shear further discloses monitoring the client-server network communications link (Wiser, col. 15 lines 1-17 and 33-43, monitoring streams for each server to client internet connection).

32. For claim 109, as applied to claim 86, Wiser, Shear do not disclose downloading at least one non-critical portion of the content to the client workstation at least two hours before serving the critical portion. However, Official Notice is taken that it was well known how to download a portion of content before serving the content (see e.g., Metz et al., US 5,768,539, col. 38 lines 29-35, download an application file and image before execution of the application). It would have been obvious for one skilled in the art at the

Art Unit: 2452

time of the invention to combine the teachings of Wiser, Shear and what was known in the art to download a portion of the content at least two hour (or any time in advance) before serving the content to serve content locally for better performance and quality.

33. For claim 110, as applied to claim 86, Wiser-ON-Shear further discloses presenting the registered user with an invoice for usage of the content (Wiser, col. 17 line 61-col. 18 line 4, invoice to user).

### ***Conclusion***

34. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hieu T. Hoang whose telephone number is 571-270-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8 a.m.-5 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2452

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

HH

/Kenny S Lin/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2452